



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,963	08/26/2003	Martin Lund	14222US02	5243
23446 7590 07/16/2010 MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD 500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL 60661				
EXAMINER				
BARQADEL, YASIN M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2456				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/16/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

<b>Application No.</b> 10/647,963	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LUND, MARTIN
<b>Examiner</b> YASIN BARQADLE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2456

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 06 July 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: None.  
Claim(s) objected to: None.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-15.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/YASIN BARQADLE/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2456

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues

In essence the Applicant argues "McGraw completely fails to disclose a switch blade. In fact, nowhere in McGraw do the terms "switch" and "switching" appear in McGraw." See for example page 7 first paragraph and the last paragraph page 8.

The Examiner notes "Office personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

For example Applicant's specification states "The switch blade 140 may be part of the backplane 130. In this regard, the switch blade 140 may be integrated within the backplane 130 or it may be a plug-in card that may be plugged into the backplane 130." [0029]. The specification also states that "Furthermore, the backplane 130 and/or the switch blades 140 may provide connectivity between the one or more of the blade servers 120 and the network 170." [0031]. Therefore, McGraw's link card/board is similar in hardware (plug-in card) and function (provide connectivity between blade server and a network). See figure 7 and paragraphs [0128-0131]. As such in light of the Applicant's disclosure McGraw's Link card/board meets the broadest reasonable interpretation of switch blade and/or switch. Furthermore, "The link card entity is a bridge between multiple chassis and is involved in proxy of commands on behalf of console server 50." (128). In other words it also provides a switching functionality between multiple chassis. Additionally, "On sensing the Identify\_Interchassis command on the local RS-485 bus, the Link Board forwards the request to the inter-chassis RS-485 bus along the out\_port and appends a <Data> field to the command." [0138]. As such McGraw's link cards/boards has the intelligence of sensing Identify\_Interchassis command and forwarding requests to the appropriate port as switches do. Therefore, McGraw's link cards/boards are not a mere network interface card or bridge as understood by the Applicant (see page 7 the last two lines of the Applicants remarks"

Applicant also argues "that nowhere in McGraw is there any disclosure regarding a central switch coupled to one or more of the switch blades of the multiserver platforms. Rather, each of McGraw's link cards/boards is part of a chassis having a plurality of blades. (See e.g., McGraw, Figure 7)" Page 10 second paragraph.

The Examiner maintains that in light of the interpretation of the functions of the link card/boards as explained above and the architecture shown in figure 7 where the middle link board interconnects between the above chassis with the lower chassis via link boards the argued central switch is taught by McGraw.